

VZCZCXYZ0001
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #0049/01 0481526
ZNY SSSSS ZZH
O R 171522Z FEB 10
FM USMISSION GENEVA
TO RHEFDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHEHAAA/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RHMFISS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0091
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 0007
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE
INFO RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV 0006
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW 0010
RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA 0006

S E C R E T GENEVA 000049

SIPDIS
DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24
CIA FOR WINPAC
JSCS FOR J5/DDGSA
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR
NSC FOR LOOK
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 2020/02/17

TAGS: PARM KACT MARR PREL RS US

SUBJECT: SFO-GVA-VIII: (U) MEETING OF THE NOTIFICATIONS PROTOCOL
WORKING GROUP, FEBRUARY 05, 2010

CLASSIFIED BY: Rose A. Gottemoeller, Assistant Secretary, Department
of State, VCI; REASON: 1.4(B), (D)

¶1. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VIII-022.

¶2. (U) Meeting Date: February 05, 2010

Time: 3:30 P.M. to 5:00 P.M.

Place: Russian Mission, Geneva

SUMMARY

¶3. (S) During a meeting of the Notifications Working Group (WG) held at the Russian Mission on February 5, the U.S. side delivered its latest proposed Joint Draft Text (JDT) of Part Four of the Protocol to the treaty, dated February 5, 2010. The United States provided an explanation of significant changes, section-by-section, in addition to justification for accepting or rejecting Russian text in specific paragraphs. The Russian side said it would review the U.S. draft text and provide comments at the next WG meeting.
End summary.

¶4. (S) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Section-By-Section; and Homework.

SECTION-BY-SECTION

15. (S) The two sides discussed all seven sections of Part Four of the Protocol. Mr. Siemon stated the U.S. side had prepared a new JDT based on the December 15, 2009, U.S.-proposed text and the December 31, 2009, Russian-proposed text; he handed over copies of the English and unofficial Russian translation to Col Ryzhkov. Following a cursory review, Ryzhkov noted the updates to the new text were well done and it looked as if the text was becoming simpler and easier to follow. He requested the U.S. side provide an overview of its draft text.

16. (S) Comments and responses on each section of the text are as follows:

-- (S) Section I. General Provisions: No changes were made to the agreed text in Section I. It was noted by Dr. Fraley that paragraph 2 duplicated Article VIII language and that perhaps it

could be eliminated in this document. Ryzhkov replied that the Russian side would review this part of the section.

-- (S) Section II. Notifications Concerning the Database: Mr. Dwyer noted that previous references to format numbers used under START were removed throughout the document. Ryzhkov indicated his agreement with this. A notification covering the transfer of strategic offensive arms (SOA) to/from a third state under an existing pattern of cooperation was added to paragraph 3, "Notification of change in MOU data." Dwyer noted that the U.S. version contained a notification on the change in status from deployed to non-deployed and vice-versa. Ryzhkov agreed that this was necessary based on the recent discussions in Moscow between CJCS Adm Mullen and General Makarov. Dwyer indicated the need may arise for a notification capturing the transfer of items to and from the Leninsk Test Range in Kazakhstan. Ryzhkov countered that these transfers should be handled through the standard notification of change in MOU data and should not have a separate notification.

-- (S) Section III. Notifications Concerning the Movement of SOA: Much of the Russian-proposed text from December 31, 2009, was accepted. Dwyer and Fraley questioned the need for the two notifications associated with major strategic exercises, paragraphs 5 and 6, since those were already covered in the September 23, 1989, Agreement on Major Strategic Exercises. Ryzhkov responded that the reduced timeline introduced in this treaty justified retaining these notifications. He also referenced additional restrictions currently being discussed in the Inspections Protocol Working Group (IPWG) that could restrict activities or inspections at a specific base.

-- (S) Section IV. Notifications Concerning Flight Tests of ICBMs and SLBMs: No changes were made to the text in this section. Siemon noted that this section could not be changed until decisions were made in the Telemetry Working Group. Ryzhkov concurred.

-- (S) Section V. Notifications Concerning Conversion or

Elimination (C or E) of Items and Facilities Subject to the Treaty: LT Sicks indicated that a placeholder for a C or E batch inspection notification was added in the event the IPWG and C or E Working Group determined it was necessary. Ryzhkov replied that such a notification could be provided using the "Notification of Completion of Conversion or Elimination," currently paragraph 3. He agreed, however, to await the outcome from ongoing decision making in the other working groups. Sicks further noted the U.S.-proposed text, paragraph 2, retained the notification requesting the annual schedule of C or E activities. Ryzhkov agreed to retain the U.S.-proposed text, but argued for the use of the term "plan" vice "schedule." The U.S. side agreed to this change.

-- (S) Section VI. Notifications Concerning Inspections and Exhibitions: The list of notifications was reordered to reflect the Russian-proposed text. LTC Leyde discussed the U.S. desire to

retain a mechanism in the new treaty to object to an inspector or aircrew member already on the approved list. Ryzhkov recommended utilizing an existing notification, to be determined at a later time. Additionally, time periods in paragraphs 11 and 12 were replaced with "XX" so that both sides would have the opportunity in the future to propose appropriate time periods. A subsection covering paragraphs 14-18 entitled "Additional Information provided by the Inspection Team Leader in Writing During On-Site Inspections" was also discussed. Leyde highlighted the importance of clarifying that these "notifications" were not submitted through the respective Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers (NRRC), but were in reality written information that the inspection team chief provided and received during on-site inspections. Sequential inspection notifications were included in this sub-section, and Leyde gave a brief explanation of the U.S.-proposed sequential inspection concept.

-- (S) Section VII. Notifications Concerning Additional Messages and the Bilateral Consultative Commission (BCC): No changes were made to the text. Siemon indicated that while the first section concerning notifications relevant to the BCC had been agreed in principle, the section retained other subsections on notifications concerning new types and new kinds (Begin comment: These definitions continue to be worked by the Definitions WG. End Comment.), mobile launchers of ICBMs, throw weight and flight tests, cooperative measures, and exchange of telemetric data. Both Siemon and Ryzhkov agreed that these subsections would be discussed after high-level political decisions were made concerning these issues.

HOMEWORK

¶7. (S) Ryzhkov told the U.S. side that he would be traveling back to Moscow in the evening and would be away from Geneva the following week. He indicated the Russian side planned to translate the U.S.-proposed JDT and review it so that discussion could continue in his absence. (Begin comment: Mr. Smirnov will lead the WG in Ryzhkov's absence. End comment.) Ryzhkov mentioned he wanted to begin considering the substance and layout of the format for the change in database notification to which Siemon replied the U.S. side would do the same.

¶8. (U) Documents provided:

- United States:

and -- JDT of Part IV to the Protocol, dated February 05, 2010;

-- Unofficial Russian Translation of the U.S.-proposed JDT of Part IV to the Protocol, dated February 05, 2010.

¶9. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Mr. Siemon

Mr. Dwyer

Dr. Fraley

Maj Johnson

LTC Leyde

Mr. McConnell

LT Sicks (RO)

Ms. Smith (Int)

RUSSIA

Mr. Ryzhkov

Mr. Smirnov

Mr. Voloskov

Ms. Komshilova (Int)

¶10. (U) Gottemoeller sends.

GRIFFITHS